



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,576	09/22/2001	Vladimir Patryshev		1962

7590 11/29/2005

VLADIMIR PATRYSHEV
277 ESTEBAN WAY
SAN JOSE, CA 95119

EXAMINER

SAIN, GAUTAM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/682,576

Applicant(s)

PATRYSHEV, VLADIMIR

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- 1) This is a final rejection in response to reply filed on 1/25/05.
- 2) Claims 1-5 are pending and rejected in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3-1) Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al (US 6092100, issued Jul 2000), in view of Horn et al (US 2002/0156688, filed Feb 21, 2001), further in view of Non-patent Literature by Janne Tuukkanen (hereinafter "Tuukkanen"), "Simple Script Security (SSS) v0.85beta", copyright 2000.

Regarding claim 1, Berstis teaches "a sample ... encoding" (ie., the URL character string having special syntax for defining a network connection requested by the client).

Berstis does not expressly teach, but Horn teaches "Unicode string" (ie., character set and use of Unicode)(paragraph 102, 103, 105).

Berstis teaches "a plurality of instructions comparing parts ... detected" (ie., the look ahead feature pulls candidate URL from the stored list that match the URL entered from the client – the system compares the URL entered against the stored candidate URL in an attempt to match)(col 1, lines 30-51).

Berstis teaches “a function ... encoding” (ie., upon a match of candidate URL with a URL in the stored list, the system completes and returns a fully-resolved URL and upon the user actuating the “enter” key, the browser is launched to the site)(col 1, lines 45-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Berstis to include Unicode string as taught by Horn, providing the benefit of a browser-client application that is optimized for user interaction to convert character sets into the client-selected character set (Horn, para 180, 105) and to make secure web pages using client side JavaScript capabilities of browsers (Tuukkanen, page 2, second, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 2, Berstis does not expressly teach, but Horn teaches “scripting ... JavaScript ... language” (ie., Javascript).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Berstis to include Javascript as taught by Horn, providing the benefit of a browser-client application that is optimized for user interaction to convert character sets into the client-selected character set (Horn, para 180, 105) and to make secure web pages using client side JavaScript capabilities of browsers (Tuukkanen, page 2, second, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 3, Berstis does not expressly teach, but Horn teaches “Utf encoding” (ie., UTF-8 encoding)(paragraph 178), “detection of multi-byte language encoding” (ie., multi-byte mapping)(paragraph 318) and “single-byte language encoding” (ie., one byte to represent each character)(paragraph 105).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Berstis to include UTF-8, multi-byte mapping and one byte character representation as taught by Horn, providing the benefit of a browser-client application that is optimized for user interaction to convert character sets into the client-selected character set (Horn, para 180, 105) and to make secure web pages using client side JavaScript capabilities of browsers (Tuukkanen, page 2, second, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 4, Berstis does not expressly teach, but Horn teaches “accompanying the form data sent from the web client ... ” (ie., form ... HTML elements ... user to fill in ...)(paragraph 202, 203).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Berstis to include HTML elements for user to fill in forms on web pages as taught by Horn, providing the benefit of a browser-client application that is optimized for user interaction to convert character sets into the client-selected character set (Horn, para 180, 105) and to make secure web pages using client side JavaScript capabilities of browsers (Tuukkanen, page 2, second, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 5, Berstis does not expressly teach, but Horn teaches “correct form data conversion on the server side ... collected” (ie., upon submission of the HTML data containing forms to the server from the client)(paragraph 202, 203).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Berstis to include submitting HTML data containing forms to the server from the client as taught by Horn, providing the benefit of a browser-client application that is optimized for user interaction to convert character sets into the client-

Art Unit: 2176

selected character set (Horn, para 180, 105) and to make secure web pages using client side JavaScript capabilities of browsers (Tuukkanen, page 2, second, third paragraph).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/25/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Berstis does not teach the claim limitations because it does not mention "encoding" anywhere in the patent text (page 9). The Examiner disagrees. The references in combination (Berstis, Horn and Janne Tuukkanen) teach the claimed limitation by applying the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language. For example, the claims use the word 'encoding' synonymous with 'detecting character set' and the references do teach detecting character sets (see above rejections for details).

The Applicant arguments emphasis points that are not specifically claimed but may be discussed in details in the description portion of the specification. With the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim language, the limitations do not preclude application of the references of record to reject the claims. For example, the Applicant argues (on page 9, middle) that Berstis' method is fuzzy and cannot be applied to fully-automated encoding detection. The Examiner disagrees, because the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims do not preclude the fuzzy detection and nor is it clear from the claims to be a "fully-automated encoding detection".

The Examiner suggests amending the claim limitations to better define/highlight the inventive elements and limitations and/or conduct an interview with the examiner to clarify the invention to the Examiner.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S-

GS

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/23/2005